



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097492,749	01/27/00	DOJARRIC	Q57649

QM01/0808  
Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER
GARTENBERG, E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3746	7

DATE MAILED: 08/08/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/492,749

Applicant(s)

DUJARRIC, CHRISTIAN  
FRANCOIS MICHEL

Examiner

Ehud Gartenberg

Art Unit

3746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on papers filed through 7/27/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 9-13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

### ***Specification***

2. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to the articles by J. Reboux, p. 13, l. 5, and Borowski p. 12, l. 30 is improper because both articles are not enabling the particular claimed invention. Applicant is required to make both said articles of record by filing a copy of each, and citing them on an IDS.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The nuclear core 18 and heat engine 19 of Fig. 1 are not enabled and they are essential to the practice of the invention, because they rotate all the propellant pumps 10, 14, 16 and electricity generator 11 which feeds the critical induction loop 4. Note that the Borowski article in Aerospace America of 7/1992 doesn't

Art Unit: 3746

enable said nuclear-core/engine combination either, in spite of claim to the contrary in the present application on p. 12, ll. 25-32.

The disclosure is also not enabling 1) how to make a Brayton cycle with a pressure ratio of 82.2 (p. 15, l. 15), and 2) the factor 0.2 on p. 17, l. 15 (denominator of the formula).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "'the" in "the ejected gases", and the limitation "which" in "which chamber". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

### ***Specification***

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the teaching on p. 9, ll. 25-26 of frequencies upwards of 10kHz does not agree with the teaching on p. 13, l. 30, of a frequency of 30,000 rpm, i.e., 500Hz.

Appropriate correction is required.

The condition of the disclosure precludes a complete examination, but to the extent that the invention can be understood, a search of prior art has been conducted and the following rejections have been made. Lack of rejection over the prior art should not be interpreted as allowable subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Art Unit: 3746

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dailey et al. 5,170,623, which teach the invention substantially as disclosed and as claimed: a propulsion device 10 having a chamber 12, a nozzle (unnumbered), and any one of the induction loops 16 connected to an inherent high-frequency (20,000Hz, see Fig. 3 for a period time of 50 microseconds) electricity generator, and a divergent section (unnumbered) downstream the loop. Note that the current in loops 16 also inherently heats the ejected gases, as disclosed and as claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey as discussed above, in view of the fact that it was conventional in the art at the time of the claimed invention to re-generatively cool parts of liquid rocket motors using one of the propellants, hence heating the propellant upstream and before the injector.

11. Claims 4 and 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Oberly 4,739,200, which

Art Unit: 3746

teaches to generate high-voltage high-power electricity for aerospace applications (col. 1, ll. 48-50, and col. 2, ll. 46) by cooling (i.e., heat exchanging) the generator with liquid hydrogen (col. 1, l. 58 and col. 3, ll. 3-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to cool the Dailey generator with a propellant fluid as taught by Oberly, in order produce high-voltage high-power electricity with minimum weight as taught by Oberly. Note that liquid hydrogen was conventionally used in LH2/LOX rocket engines at the time of the claimed invention (Oberly, Fig. 8, 40 and 52), and therefore the Oberly engine had two separate inlets, one for LH2 and the other for LOX.

Applicant is reminded that lack of rejection over the prior art should not be interpreted as allowable subject matter, in view of the rejection under 35USC112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ehud Gartenberg whose telephone number is 703/308-2634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy S Thorpe can be reached on 703/308-0102. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/305-3588 for regular communications and 703/305-3588 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3746

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/308-0861.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ehud Gartenberg", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Ehud Gartenberg  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3746

August 7, 2001